

Serial No. - 10/706,263
Art Unit - 2874

REMARKS

Claims 2-47 and 51-69 are currently pending in the present application. By the present amendment, claims 65 and 66 have been amended to correct their dependency. No additional amendments are presented in this response.

Claims 2-4, 6-10, 13-19, 21-25, 37 and 67-69 have been rejected under 35 US 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,371,813 (the Artigue patent). Claims 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Artigue patent. Claims 5, 20, 26-36, 38-47 and 64-66 have been objected to but indicated allowable. Claims 51-63 have been allowed. Thus, the only reference applied to the claims in the present prosecution is the Artigue patent. However, contrary to the Examiner's statement that all elements are disclosed in the Artigue patent, the "optical amplification medium" recited in each independent claim is not, so the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Specifically, referring to independent claim 67 as an example, the claim recites an integrated optical device that comprises a waveguide body, a spectral combiner/divider near a boundary of the waveguide body, a primary input/output channel, and a set of displaced input/output channels defined in the waveguide body. According to the recitations of claim 67, "at least a substantial portion of [the] waveguide body comprises an optical amplification medium."

The Office Action refers to column 1, lines 11-19, of the Artigue patent in support of this grounds of rejection. However, careful review of this portion of the patent, presented below for clarity, reveals that the Artigue reference merely notes that the bandwidth restrictions of available optical amplifiers limits the range of usable wavelengths in integrated optoelectronic circuits.

The range of usable wavelengths is usually limited, however, for at least two reasons: the need to distribute the wavelengths between the various types of system application (direct or coherent detection, local area networks or long-haul transmission, etc) and the possible benefits of working within the bandwidth of available optical amplifiers (rare earth doped optical fiber amplifiers, semiconductor amplifiers, etc). Artigue, col. 1, lines 11-19.

Serial No. - 10/706,263
Art Unit - 2874

Thus, while it may be proper to infer from the above-noted excerpt that integrated optoelectronic circuits are designed to work within the bandwidth of available optical amplifiers, the Artigue patent falls far short of suggesting that an optical amplification medium be comprised in a waveguide body of a mux/demux integrated optical device comprising a spectral combiner/divider near a boundary of the waveguide body, a primary input/output channel defined in the waveguide body, and a set of displaced input/output channels defined in the waveguide body. The Artigue patent simply lacks any suggestion that an optical amplification medium be incorporated into a waveguide body of the nature recited in the presently pending independent claims.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to resolve efficiently any formal matters or to discuss any aspects of the application or of this response. Otherwise, early notification of allowable subject matter is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

DINSMORE & SHOHL L.L.P.

By 

James E. Beyer

Registration No. 39,564

One Dayton Centre
One South Main Street, Suite 1300
Dayton, Ohio 45402-2023
Telephone: (937) 449-6400
Facsimile: (937) 449-6405
e-mail: james.beyer@dinslaw.com

JEB/AMM

41472v1